

特許協力条約

発信人 日本国特許庁 (国際調査機関)

REC'D 11 AUG 2005

WIPO

PCT

代理人

大野 聖二

様

あて名

〒100-6036

日本国東京都千代田区霞が関3丁目2番5号 霞が
関ビル36階 大野総合法律事務所

PCT

国際調査機関の見解書
(法施行規則第40条の2)
[PCT規則43の2.1]

発送日
(日.月.年)

09. 8. 2005

出願人又は代理人

の書類記号 PME-9029W0

今後の手続きについては、下記2を参照すること。

国際出願番号:

PCT/J P 2005/007891

国際出願日

(日.月.年) 26. 04. 2005

優先日

(日.月.年) 07. 05. 2004

国際特許分類 (IPC) IntCl.⁷ H04N5/222, F16M11/00, 13/02, G03B17/56

出願人 (氏名又は名称)

松下電器産業株式会社

1. この見解書は次の内容を含む。

☒ 第I欄 見解の基礎

☐ 第II欄 優先権

☐ 第III欄 新規性、進歩性又は産業上の利用可能性についての見解の不作成

☐ 第IV欄 発明の単一性の欠如

☒ 第V欄 PCT規則43の2.1(a)(i)に規定する新規性、進歩性又は産業上の利用可能性についての見解、それを裏付けるための文献及び説明

☐ 第VI欄 ある種の引用文献

☐ 第VII欄 国際出願の不備

☐ 第VIII欄 国際出願に対する意見

2. 今後の手続き

国際予備審査の請求がされた場合は、出願人がこの国際調査機関とは異なる国際予備審査機関を選択し、かつ、その国際予備審査機関がPCT規66.1の2(b)の規定に基づいて国際調査機関の見解書を国際予備審査機関の見解書とみなさない旨を国際事務局に通知していた場合を除いて、この見解書は国際予備審査機関の最初の見解書とみなされる。

この見解書が上記のように国際予備審査機関の見解書とみなされる場合、様式PCT/ISA/220を送付した日から3月又は優先日から22月のうちいずれか遅く満了する期限が経過するまでに、出願人は国際予備審査機関に、適当な場合は補正書とともに、答弁書を提出することができる。

さらなる選択肢は、様式PCT/ISA/220を参照すること。

3. さらなる詳細は、様式PCT/ISA/220の備考を参照すること。

見解書を作成した日

20. 07. 2005

名称及びあて先

日本国特許庁 (ISA/J P)

郵便番号100-8915

東京都千代田区霞が関三丁目4番3号

特許庁審査官 (権限のある職員)

富田 高史

5 P

2952

電話番号 03-3581-1101 内線 3581

様式PCT/ISA/237 (表紙) (2004年1月)

第 I 欄 見解の基礎

1. この見解書は、下記に示す場合を除くほか、国際出願の言語を基礎として作成された。

- ☐ この見解書は、_____ 語による翻訳文を基礎として作成した。
それは国際調査のために提出された PCT 規則 12.3 及び 23.1(b) にいう翻訳文の言語である。

2. この国際出願で開示されかつ請求の範囲に係る発明に不可欠なヌクレオチド又はアミノ酸配列に関して、以下に基づき見解書を作成した。

a. タイプ ☐ 配列表

☐ 配列表に関連するテーブル

b. フォーマット ☐ 書面

☐ コンピュータ読み取り可能な形式

c. 提出時期 ☐ 出願時の国際出願に含まれる

☐ この国際出願と共にコンピュータ読み取り可能な形式により提出された

☐ 出願後に、調査のために、この国際調査機関に提出された

3. ☐ さらに、配列表又は配列表に関連するテーブルを提出した場合に、出願後に提出した配列若しくは追加して提出した配列が出願時に提出した配列と同一である旨、又は、出願時の開示を超える事項を含まない旨の陳述書の提出があった。

4. 補足意見：

第V欄 新規性、進歩性又は産業上の利用可能性についてのPCT規則43の2.1(a)(i)に定める見解、それを裏付ける文献及び説明

1. 見解

新規性 (N)	請求の範囲	4	有 無
	請求の範囲	1-3	
進歩性 (IS)	請求の範囲		有 無
	請求の範囲	1-4	
産業上の利用可能性 (IA)	請求の範囲	1-4	有 無
	請求の範囲		

2. 文献及び説明

文献1 : JP 2002-290774 A (三洋電機株式会社) 2002.10.04, 第1図, 第2図 (ファミリーなし)

文献2 : JP 57-200069 U (東京芝浦電気株式会社) 1982.12.20, 第2図 (ファミリーなし)

請求の範囲1-3に係る発明は、国際調査報告で引用された文献1に記載されているので、新規性、進歩性を有しない。

請求の範囲4に係る発明は、文献1と国際調査報告で引用された文献2とにより進歩性を有しない。文献1に記載された取り付けアームに、文献2に記載されたようにケーブルを導通することは、当業者にとって容易である。

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

PCT

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

To:

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.1)

<p>To:</p>		<p>Date of mailing (day/month/year)</p>
<p>Applicant's or agent's file reference PME-9029WO</p>		<p>FOR FURTHER ACTION See paragraph 2 below</p>
<p>International application No. PCT/JP2005/007891</p>	<p>International filing date (day/month/year) 26.04.2005</p>	<p>Priority date (day/month/year) 07.05.2004</p>
<p>International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC</p>		
<p>Applicant MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.</p>		

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. I	Basis of the opinion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. II	Priority
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. III	Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. IV	Lack of unity of invention
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Box No. V	Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VI	Certain documents cited
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VII	Certain defects in the international application
<input type="checkbox"/>	Box No. VIII	Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

<p>Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP</p>	<p>Authorized officer</p>
<p>Facsimile No.</p>	<p>Telephone No.</p>

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/007891

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/007891

Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)	Claims	<u>4</u>	YES
	Claims	<u>1-3</u>	NO
Inventive step (IS)	Claims		YES
	Claims	<u>1-4</u>	NO
Industrial applicability (IA)	Claims	<u>1-4</u>	YES
	Claims		NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP 2002-290774 A (Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.), 04 October 2002, Figs. 1 and 2
(Family: none)

Document 2: JP 57-200069 U (Tokyo Shibaura Denki K.K.), 20 December 1982, Fig. 2
(Family: none)

The inventions relating to claims 1-3 are described in document 1 cited in the ISR; therefore, they do not appear to be novel or involve an inventive step.

The invention relating to claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1, and document 2 cited in the ISR. In mounting arms described in document 1, passing through cables as described in document 2 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.

PATENT COOPERATION TREATY

TRANSLATION

From the
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

PCT

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

(PCT Rule 43bis.I)

To:

Date of mailing
(day/month/year)

Applicant's or agent's file reference

PME-9029WO

FOR FURTHER ACTION

See paragraph 2 below

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/007891

International filing date (day/month/year)

26.04.2005

Priority date (day/month/year)

07.05.2004

International Patent Classification (IPC) or both national classification and IPC

Applicant

MATSUSHITA ELECTRIC INDUSTRIAL CO., LTD.

1. This opinion contains indications relating to the following items:

- ☒ Box No. I Basis of the opinion
- ☐ Box No. II Priority
- ☐ Box No. III Non-establishment of opinion with regard to novelty, inventive step and industrial applicability
- ☐ Box No. IV Lack of unity of invention
- ☒ Box No. V Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability; citations and explanations supporting such statement
- ☐ Box No. VI Certain documents cited
- ☐ Box No. VII Certain defects in the international application
- ☐ Box No. VIII Certain observations on the international application

2. **FURTHER ACTION**

If a demand for international preliminary examination is made, this opinion will be considered to be a written opinion of the International Preliminary Examining Authority ("IPEA") except that this does not apply where the applicant chooses an Authority other than this one to be the IPEA and the chosen IPEA has notified the International Bureau under Rule 66.1bis(b) that written opinions of this International Searching Authority will not be so considered.

If this opinion is, as provided above, considered to be a written opinion of the IPEA, the applicant is invited to submit to the IPEA a written reply together, where appropriate, with amendments, before the expiration of 3 months from the date of mailing of Form PCT/ISA/220 or before the expiration of 22 months from the priority date, whichever expires later.

For further options, see Form PCT/ISA/220.

3. For further details, see notes to Form PCT/ISA/220.

Name and mailing address of the ISA/JP

Authorized officer

Facsimile No.

Telephone No.

WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/007891

Box No. I

Basis of this opinion

1. With regard to the language, this opinion has been established on the basis of the international application in the language in which it was filed, unless otherwise indicated under this item.
☐ This opinion has been established on the basis of a translation from the original language into the following language _____, which is the language of a translation furnished for the purposes of international search (under Rule 12.3 and 23.1(b)).
2. With regard to any nucleotide and/or amino acid sequence disclosed in the international application and necessary to the claimed invention, this opinion has been established on the basis of:
 - a. type of material
☐ a sequence listing
☐ table(s) related to the sequence listing
 - b. format of material
☐ in written format
☐ in computer readable form
 - c. time of filing/furnishing
☐ contained in the international application as filed.
☐ filed together with the international application in computer readable form.
☐ furnished subsequently to this Authority for the purposes of search.
3. ☐ In addition, in the case that more than one version or copy of a sequence listing and/or table(s) relating thereto has been filed or furnished, the required statements that the information in the subsequent or additional copies is identical to that in the application as filed or does not go beyond the application as filed, as appropriate, were furnished.
4. Additional comments:

**WRITTEN OPINION OF THE
INTERNATIONAL SEARCHING AUTHORITY**

International application No.

PCT/JP2005/007891

Box No. V

Reasoned statement under Rule 43bis.1(a)(i) with regard to novelty, inventive step or industrial applicability;
citations and explanations supporting such statement

1. Statement

Novelty (N)

Claims 4

YES

Claims 1-3

NO

Inventive step (IS)

Claims

YES

Claims 1-4

NO

Industrial applicability (IA)

Claims

1-4

YES

Claims

NO

2. Citations and explanations:

Document 1: JP 2002-290774 A (Sanyo Electric Co., Ltd.), 04 October 2002, Figs. 1 and 2
(Family: none)

Document 2: JP 57-200069 U (Tokyo Shibaura Denki K.K.), 20 December 1982, Fig. 2
(Family: none)

The inventions relating to claims 1-3 are described in document 1 cited in the ISR; therefore, they do not appear to be novel or involve an inventive step.

The invention relating to claim 4 does not appear to involve an inventive step based on document 1, and document 2 cited in the ISR. In mounting arms described in document 1, passing through cables as described in document 2 would be easy for a party skilled in the art.